



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/782,751 | 02/23/2004 | Nicolas Popp | 026970-002500US | 6185 |
| 20350 7590 12/03/2008 TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834 | | | | |
| EXAMINER SIMITOSKI, MICHAEL J | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 2434 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 12/03/2008 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/782,751

Applicant(s)

POPP, NICOLAS

Examiner

MICHAEL J. SIMITOSKI

Art Unit

2434

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MICHAEL J. SIMITOSKI.

(3) _____.

(2) James Golladay.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 24 November 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Dutta.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant and the Examiner discussed believed differences between Dutta and the invention. One such difference is that Dutta does not disclose a public key x.509 certificate, but the claim language is believed broad enough to cover Dutta's encrypted RVO because "certificate" alone is not clearly defined such that it requires more limitations than Dutta discloses. No particular agreement was reached.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Michael J Simitoski/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2434